

TERMS!
The Principia
Published Weekly for the PRINCIPIA ASSOCIATION
at No. 101 William Street, near John St.
Rev. WILLIAM GOODELL, Editor.
Rev. G. B. CHURCH, D. D., Editors.
J. W. ALDEN, Publisher.
TERMS: Two Dollars a year, in advance.
Two dollars and fifty cents if payment be delayed
six months.
Fifty cents a year in addition for the paper delivered
by carrier within Brooklyn or New York.
Advertisements.—Ten cents a line for each inser-
tion, payable in advance.
Advertisements amounting to
\$20.00 20 per cent discount.
\$30.00 30
\$40.00 40
\$50.00 and upwards 50
Notices.—All religious and other notices will be
charged ten cents a line for each insertion.
Letters directed to Rev. WILLIAM GOODELL, Editor,
or Rev. G. B. CHURCH, must be superscribed with
our Post Office box 4381, or we shall be subjected to
additional postage.
All checks or drafts should be made payable to
"J. W. ALDEN or order," and all remittances and
business communications directed to
J. W. ALDEN, Publisher,
Box 4381 New York.

AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP.
CAN THE STATE ENSLAVE ITS OWN
CITIZENS?

The first in the series of Lectures on the Revolution
in the Church of the Puritans, Wednesday evening
April 8, 1863.

[Concluded.]

BY REV. G. B. CHURCH, D. D.

But let us now analyze this claim of the right of
enslaving free persons, white or black, a little
more particularly, with relation to specific articles
of the Constitution, and to their operation.

Let us read the Constitution in connection with
this claim of the States under it, the claim of the
sovereign rights to enslave whosoever of the in-
habitants, white or black, it pleases them.

FIRST, THE PREAMBLE.

We the people of the United States, in order
to form a more perfect Union—do hereby declare that
each State shall have the right to enslave its own in-
habitants. We the people of the United States, in
order to establish justice—do hereby declare that
each State shall have the right to enslave its own in-
habitants. We the people of the United States, in
order to ensure domestic tranquility—do hereby
declare that each State shall have the right to enslave
its own inhabitants. We the people of the United
States, in order to provide for the common defense—
do hereby declare that each State shall have the right
to enslave its own inhabitants. We the people of the
United States, in order to promote the general
welfare, do hereby declare that each State shall have
the right to enslave its own inhabitants. We the
people of the United States, in order to secure the
blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity
do hereby declare that each State shall have the right
to enslave its own inhabitants. And for these pur-
poses we do ordain and establish this Constitution
for the United States of America.

Article 4. Section 2. The citizens of each State
shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities
of citizens in the several States and each State
having the supreme right to enslave its own free
inhabitants, white or black, the citizens of each
State shall be entitled to be so enslaved by any other
State according to the privileges secured to the
citizens of the several States. It being one of
their immunities to be enslaved at home, the same
immunity shall be possessed and enjoyed abroad,
in every other State, and no citizen of any State
can plead exemption from this liability to slavery
in any other State, any more than in his own.

Section 4. The United States shall guarantee
to every State in this Union a Republican form
of government, including the right to enslave any
of its white inhabitants and all its free blacks.
And in order the more perfectly to insure domestic
tranquility, and protect each State against domestic
violence, the sovereign right, in each State, of
enslaving any of its inhabitants, white or black
shall not be infringed upon or interfered
against, by the United States.

Domestic violence does not mean the violence
taking away of the rights and liberties of such
persons and their families as the States may choose
to molest, but it means any attempt to prevent
such violence, and therefore the United States
shall protect each of the States against any such
attempt.

And domestic tranquility does not mean and
cannot mean the tranquil enjoyment of each person,
in his own family, of the rights of liberty and
justice, but it means the quiet and uninterrupted
exercise of the right of each State to enslave any
of its inhabitants, white or black, undisturbed
by any local or foreign opposition or violence,
against which violence the United States are
bound to interfere, and to protect the domestic
tranquility of each State in exercising its sovereign
right of enslavement.

SECURITY AGAINST UNREASONABLE SEIZURES.

Again, Article 1. (Amendment) "The right of
the people (that is, the inhabitants of the States,
white or black, we the people) to be secure in
their persons against unreasonable seizures shall
not be violated." What are unreasonable seizures?
If a State has the sovereign right to enslave, it
must be provided with victims. Is it proper to
seize five persons against unreasonable seizures,
when such seizures are made in the exercise of a
sovereign State right? Such a violation of this
right as the seizing of a man and his family to
make slaves of them is no violation at all, if done
by the majority, or by the State, but is simply
the exercise of a sovereign right of government,
against which no right of freedom can stand.

Perhaps it may be argued that such a seizure,
when once the State has determined to enslave
any of the whites or all the free blacks, is
not unreasonable but merely the carrying out
of an inalienable right of state sovereignty, and
therefore both reasonable and necessary, and
consequently that no power or right exists in the
government under the Constitution to forbid such
violence, nor any right to interfere for the protection
of the people against such violent seizure; it being
the right of the State to order and execute
such seizure, anything in the Constitution or
laws of the United States to the contrary not
withstanding.

Such is the palpable absurdity of the infinitely
wicked claim of a sovereign right of government
to enslave its subjects. There cannot be any such
right, and if it be maintained it destroys the
Constitution. The articles of the Constitution fight
against each other. It becomes a contrivance of
machinery for the purpose of contradiction and
confusion, an arrangement of wheels and
cogs playing against each other in unextinguishable
confusion.

In section 3, of article 4, it is declared that
nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed
as to prejudice any claims of any particular
State.

This article may be so interpreted and pressed
as to destroy the force of all that precedes it, for-
bidding any power whatever. No restriction
upon any State can stand for one moment. Sec-
tion 10, of Article 1, declares that "no State shall
enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation."
But section 3, of article 4, forbids anything in the
Constitution from being "so construed as to pre-
judice any claim of any particular State." Con-
sequently, if any State shall claim the right to
enter into confederation with the rebel States, or
if the rebel States claim that right with one an-
other, it cannot be interfered with or restricted; for
nothing in the Constitution can be so construed as
to prejudice that, or any claim whatever.

The provision claimed as securing the freedom
of the slaves declared free on the first of Janu-

The Principia

First Principles in Religion, Morals, Government, and the Economy of Life.

VOL. IV.—NO. 4. NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, APRIL 30, 1863. WHOLE NO. 160.

any such becomes a nullity. And whereas it is
said that "this Constitution (article 6) and the
laws of the United States shall be made in
pursuance thereof shall be the supreme law of
the land, anything in the Constitution or laws of
any State to the contrary notwithstanding," you have
but to add to this that provision in section 3,
of article 4, that "nothing in this Constitution shall
be so construed as to prejudice any claims of any
particular State," and article 6, concerning the
supremacy of the Constitution is nullified. You
are forbidden from interpreting anything in the
Constitution as against the claim of any State to
enter into any Confederacy, or to enslave any of
the people, or to do any sovereign act whatever
that it pleases.

**A STRICT CONSTRUCTION OF THE CONSTITUTION
REQUIRED BY JUSTICE.**

A claim against natural right cannot be made
good by any law; all pretended law enforcing it
is null and void. A claim against humanity,
against the very purposes for which human gov-
ernments are established, a claim against govern-
ment, a mere agency or tool to do that for the
purpose of preventing which government is or-
dained and sanctioned of the Almighty, cannot
stand upon law, cannot make law, any more than
a corporation of counterfeiters could make legiti-
mate and valid coin. But if it could, if law could
be pleaded for it, for slavery, for example, still
whatsoever law or right of liberty exists, takes
precedence, and is to be completely fulfilled and
satisfied, before any place or person can be
given for the operation of the law of slavery; and
if, in the attempted execution of that law, the
law of liberty be transgressed or violated, or the
right of a single human being to freedom taken
away or broken, then the supremacy and majesty
of the law of freedom must be maintained, and
the full penalty for violating it executed.

If there is anything left for the slaveholder
after the law of liberty is fulfilled, and every
man's natural rights protected, he may have it;
but if not, he is a thief and a robber under
United States law, and as such must be dealt with,
and his victims delivered. If a man leaves a will,
devising his property, first to his nearest kin,
and afterwards to some distant individual or cor-
poration, the latter can have no claim in law or
equity, till the former be fulfilled; and if legacies
are bequeathed, they are void until it be proved
that the estate is sufficient first of all for the first
bequests; they cannot be placed to the injury or
non-fulfillment of the body of the will, and if any
person to whom a legacy of a thousand dollars was
given in his will should attempt to enforce it, and
to take that sum, regardless of the heirs, he would
be arrested and punished as a villain; and if any
Court should undertake to claim the decree of the
Court would be broken. He must wait, till all
the obligations of the will before his are satisfied,
and then, if anything remains it is his, by
right. Just so with the will of the people, which
is the will of our fathers in their name and for
them, in the Constitution.

THE CONSTITUTION A DEATH-BLOW TO FREEDOM.

It is a device in behalf of freedom, and not
that obligation is fulfilled, that bequest fund and
secured, can there be any other claim. If
there be anything left for slavery after the plain
bequests for freedom are executed, or if any con-
dition can be executed in behalf of slavery, without
damage to the interests of freedom, or if any gift
of slavery can be bestowed upon any would be
slaveholder under this instrument, claiming to
have been affectionately remembered by the
fathers, without injury to the freedom of any per-
son secured by the same instrument, then he and
all his relatives are welcome to all that they can
get out of the will, after its covenant of freedom
is secured to all. But until that, if he attempts
to take his pretended legacy, he must go, himself,
to the State Prison. The man that undertakes
to make himself a slaveholder, by trespassing upon
the rights of the poorest, meanest, most unprotected
creature of the people of the United States,
whose rights of freedom are the first things guar-
anteed in this instrument, and for the establish-
ment and protection of which it was wholly
framed, is a traitor and a villain, and as such
must be punished. If he dares to claim and de-
mand, as property, one of the persons for the pro-
tection of whose rights of freedom this instrument
was drawn up, he is a man-stealer, and as such
the Constitution deals with him, but says nothing,
knows nothing, of a slaveholder. The Constitu-
tion is a bond of freedom, so that, even if there
were in it an article of slavery, if any man in
pursuance of that article trespass by one hair's
breadth upon the first security of freedom, he is
arrested; and if any law passed in pursuance of
that article trespass, in like manner, upon any
guarantee of freedom, it is null and void. The
guarantees of personal freedom are first and
supreme, are those things in the Constitution with-
out which it would be worthless, would be a mere
despotism, are indeed the whole object and law
of the Constitution.

The sacredness and severity of our Constitu-
tion on the side of freedom ought to be, at least,
as great as that of Venice; and if we had a Por-
cia to defend the cause, if the wives of our Editors
and Statesmen could be commissioned: there
would be no danger. They would say to the cap-
tured Shylocks of the oligarchy, Take your
pretended bond and execute it; but in doing it
you shed one drop of the blood of freedom, or
attain one hair, in all this continent, you die, and
all your goods are confiscated.

INFAMY AND WICKEDNESS OF THIS THEORY.

The oppression of the Poles, the partition of
Poland, the serfdom of the Russians, the despot-
ism of Austria, the oppression of the Italians,
would be small crimes, in comparison with the
crime against God and humanity, thus assumed
as a right of government, a sovereign right of
making merchandise of men, established in an
element of essential sovereignty belonging to
every one of 33 States, and to be exercised by
each of them at pleasure, and against which, for
protection or deliverance of the persons enslaved,
the actual general government could not inter-
pose.

If this theory of government were carried out,
and every State undertook to practice upon it,
what would become of the article in our Constitu-
tion that all the citizens of each State are entitled
to the same protection in every other State as to
their own, the same rights guaranteed to them by
the general government? A black man of Massa-
chusetts removing into Arkansas has, by the Con-
stitution, the same right of citizenship in Arkan-
sas as in Massachusetts. But this theory permits
him no right but that of being seized in Arkan-
sas and made a slave, and the general govern-
ment forbidden from interfering in his behalf.
And a white man in Arkansas removing into
Massachusetts may be seized and made a slave,

if the people of Massachusetts choose to pass
such a law; and the government cannot inter-
fere.

There is moreover the baseness of admitting
that the citizens of a foreign government possess
a security, a protection which our own govern-
ment cannot afford to its citizens. If the wife of
another man were ill-treated, you would have a
right to interfere, but if your own wife were in-
sulted, you must remain quiet, must look on, and
guarantee the insult, and protect the villain from
punishment. If the children of another man were
seized, you would have a right to interfere; but
if your own children, you must not attempt it,
you are forbid, stopped by law, you must keep
quiet, and admit the sovereign right of capturing
your own children, and must exercise only the
right of protecting the children of your neigh-
bor.

NATURE OF THIS STATE SOVEREIGNTY.

The ground of all this is the pretence of sov-
ereignty in each State to make what laws it pleases,
in regard to its own domestic institutions and
civil arrangements. The Federal government, it
is asserted, cannot interfere. And the constitution
seems to be this, that whatever the Federal gov-
ernment cannot interfere to prevent, that becomes
the right of a State government. Suppose a State
government should set up the worship of Moloch,
and order the sacrifice, every year, of fifty chil-
dren to be taken by lot from all the families in
the State. Would the Federal government have
power to prevent such an outrage? If not, is
the right of such impiety a right of government?
Does the enactment of idolatry and murder be-
come a State right, because it is not prohibited in
the Constitution?

When the Constitution says, all the powers not
herein expressly delegated to the government
are reserved to the States, it means such powers
as are consistent with the just and benevolent
objects of government, and not such powers as
are Satanic, cruel, oppressive, impious. Such
powers no human Constitution of government can
grant, and every government is bound to forbid.

POWERS FORBIDDEN IN THE CONSTITUTION.

And such powers are forbidden in our Constitu-
tion, expressly. The assurance that no per-
son shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property,
but by the process of law, forbids them. Take
for example the supposed establishment of idola-
try, with the sacrifice of children by State law.
Children are persons, and even if no other article
could reach them for their protection, that does.
Suppose that the State of Arkansas should con-
stitute a network of State law providing for the
practice of this horrid cruelty, just as it has a
system of State laws providing that the children
born of slave mothers shall be slaves. Would
our government have no right, no obligation, no
power, to forbid such cruelty and to rescue the
intended victims of it? Even if there were no-
thing in the Constitution forbidding it, our gov-
ernment would be bound by the Common Law of
God and of Christianity to interpose. If not, then
the people would be bound to revolutionize the
government.

But a system of State law protecting idolatry
and requiring the sacrifice of children to Moloch
would be no worse than a system of State law
protecting slavery, and appointing a certain class
to be slaves and to be used for the purpose of
breeding slaves and condemning their children
to be slaves and their children's children, forever.
And the article in our Constitution guaranteeing
that no person shall be deprived of liberty with-
out due process of law is as sufficient, as powerful
for the protection of children from being made
slaves, and it is for the protection of children
born alive taken and burned upon altars, or
thrown alive into the Mississippi.

Yet it is affirmed that Missouri has a perfect
right to re-establish slavery, even if slavery were
abolished. This is the doctrine of Saulsbury and
the Copperheads; but we did not expect to see it
so soon re-iterated and sanctioned and affirmed
by professed republicans at the North.

THE PRETENDED RIGHT TO RE-ESTABLISH SLAVERY.

A right to re-establish slavery? And we should
like to know on whom this right is going to be
exercised? A right to emigrate to the Moon, and
to take all the black race thither? We insist on
knowing who are to be the parties on whom this
right is to be exercised. All in the State are free.
But according to this infernal theory, the State
has only to pass a law establishing slavery, and
providing a particular class, say all that have
red hair, to be slaves, and forthwith any of these
fortunate persons may be seized and sold as
slaves, according to this law, and our government
when appealed to for protection, on the ground
of the guarantee that no person shall be deprived
of life, liberty, or property without due process
of law, can only answer that it is by the process
of law that they are deprived of liberty, and the
government can do nothing for them. It is on
this ground that the rebellion itself may be just-
ified, and our government deprived of all right
against the rebels. For the rebel States it is
affirmed are still sovereign States, and Secretary
Seward is inviting them back to their vacant seats
of power in our national Legislature. It is as
sovereign States simply that they have passed
and established laws making the allegiance of
every citizen due supremely and solely to them-
selves, and so it is according to due process of
law that they have supreme authority over the
life, liberty and property of every person, and our
government has no right to interfere. Therefore
they proceed to confiscate and take away from
every Union man every foot of his landed estate,
and every shred of his property. They are not
very full of confiscation to confirm the owner-
ship of every Union man's property to his chil-
dren. But they take it utterly away, as by this
theory of State sovereignty they have a perfect
right to do, and our government has no right to
interfere. If the Union men thus deprived of
property appeal to our government, all that our
government can do is just to answer, your prop-
erty has been taken from you by due process of
law, and the United States government can do
nothing for you. The United States Government
has no constitutional authority to protect you,
either in life, liberty, or property. The United
States government can do nothing but submit.
The United States government are not a govern-
ment sovereign and supreme, but the rebel States
are, each in itself, a perfect and supreme sov-
ereignty, over life, liberty and property, by just
such law as they may choose to promulgate.

ATROCITY OF OUR TREATMENT OF THE BLACKS.

It would probably be impossible to adduce any
instance in the history of civilization of such glaring
cruelty and contempt of law and of right on the
part of any government towards one class of
its citizens, combined with such tenderness to-
wards open traitors in arms, such carelessness for
the rights of victims, such perversion of law on one
side for the sanction and perpetuity of the
cruelty of slavery, and on the other side for
the shielding of the rebel slaveholders from the
just consequences of their crimes. Such is the
favoritism of our government towards slavery
even in the midst of a rebellion for the suprema-
cy of slavery by the destruction of the govern-
ment. The government are providing for the
continuance and establishment of that landed
aristocracy, for the sake of the privileges and
dominion of which the rebellion has been under-
taken, and the war of the rebellion is being waged.
The rights of the slaves are ignored, denied, and
permitted to be trampled on; the rights of the
rebels are maintained, their inalienable sov-
ereignty over their slaves, and their right of slave-
holding, are maintained as perpetual; and the
same Constitution which they themselves have
rejected, adopting a new one of their own, is pre-
served and laid up for them, with its law of
interpretation in accordance with their own slave
codes, awaiting their return into the Union, their
reception into chambers empty, swept and gar-
nished, as a company of deluded devils, tempted
into their comfortable in the Union by the
imagination that their privilege of demoraliza-

tion and enslave five hundred Englishmen,
Frischmen, or Africans. The State of Kentucky
is guilty of piracy in that act of enslaving free
blacks. When Gordon, the slave-captain, was
hanged, it was for seizing human beings with the
intent to make slaves of them; but this offence
was no wicked, nor more directly a defiance,
violation and attempted nullification of United
States Law, than the act of Kentucky, for which
Kentucky as thoroughly deserves to be hanged as
a State as Gordon ever deserved to be hanged as
an individual. Piracy cannot be an offence worthy
of death in Africa and a political and moral right-
eousness in America.

If this wickedness is committed under color of
law, by means of law-pleaded as sanctioning it,
then it is doubly criminal, and our government
doubly criminal in permitting, for there is no
wickedness so great and deadly as that which is
enacted by law, and then pleaded as right-
eous.

Whether done by authority of slave codes,
or without any authority by the assumption of
power, however, it is the crime of man-stealing;
the enslaving of one man or of five hundred,
by law or without law, is that crime. Whether
it be committed upon black men or white,
the outrage is the same, the crime the same,
and a State and a government which will permit
it against the blacks will also against the whites,
against any class of the whites at any time obnoxious
to the political majority. And the Constitu-
tion in which this right of the enslavement of
human beings is enshrined on guaranteed as the
attribute of a Sovereign State, the element of
State Sovereignty, provides for it and guarantees
it as directly against the whites as against the
blacks; and if ever in any case the blacks should
come to be the political majority or the numerical
majority with power, they would have the Constitu-
tional right to enslave any or all of the whites,
or any caste or tribe of them set apart by social
and civil attainments as mendicants; and any general
among the black armies might as properly defend
slavery on the ground of the necessity of having
a servile class for the highest development and
civilization of the reigning race of the blacks, and
their clergy might as properly set down the slav-
ery of the whites as a provision for the fulfill-
ment of God's curse upon "Canaan," and an article
of orthodox theology and piety. And it would be
as good an article of American black justice
that white men have no rights that black men are
bound to respect, as the Dred Scott decision
was of American white justice. And any State
might as consistently and Constitutionally pass a
bill of attainder under the authority and title of
the slave code, consigning the caste of white men
and their children to perpetual slavery, and it
would be as impossible for the government to
interfere for the rescue of these white citizens, as
it is now affirmed to be for the government to in-
terfere in behalf of the blacks. Yet every slave
code is in fact a bill of attainder, of the worst
possible kind, and repeatedly and explicitly for-
bidden by our Constitution. But the law of the slave
code, by which this country always has been gov-
erned is that the slave codes shall be the
supreme law, anything in the Constitution and
laws of the United States to the contrary notwith-
standing.

THE WAR.

The Princeton Review Reviewed.
—In the light of its own theology and ethics.

SUMMER SEVEN.

God in History. Is History Judicial?

USES OF HISTORY.

The grand, ultimate use of history; the end,
aim, and object of Scripture history, is the mani-
festation of God's glory, in his providential care,
morality, government, and sovereign control over
mankind—that some glory which he unveiled to
Moses, in declaring his own moral attributes,
(Exodus 24: 6, 7.) This manifestation necessarily
includes a correct delineation of man, his na-
ture, character, actions, and condition, the laws by
which he is governed, and the results of his con-
formity or non-conformity to those laws, which are
the laws of his Creator.

Man exists in society, in communities, in na-
tions, wherein human actions, human character,
and corresponding human conditions and desti-
nities, whether good or evil, whether happy or
wretched, whether elevated or degraded, are most
conspicuously witnessed, most readily distin-
guished, most conveniently recorded, most exten-
sively and most prominently known and remem-
bered.

History, accordingly, treats chiefly of man in
communities, in nations. Its province is to record
the founding and growth of nations, the influ-
ences that operate upon them, their diversities
and resemblances of character, their national as-
pirations, activities, and the results of them, under
divine Providence, and under the laws of social
humanity, which are the laws of their Creator,
the laws of their being.

This it is that makes history instructive; "phi-
losophy," or more properly, "theory," "teaching
by example." Aside from this, the study of his-
tory could lay no foundation for political science,
nor could any such science, on the principles of
inductive philosophy, ever be built; for the whole
purpose of national retribution underlies the di-
vine laws of moral and political cause and effect.
Aside from that purpose, therefore, the study of
history would be of no more value to the states-
man than the study of a kaleidoscope. For want
of a proper understanding of this, the reading of
history is dry, uninteresting, or of little use, to
most men. He only who sees the purpose, the
agency, the heart, and the hand of God, in his-
tory, has eyes wherewith to read history, for his
high and noble ends, the glory of God, and the
highest good of mankind. The College of New
Jersey once had a President who wrote an out-
line of a system of theology, in the form of an
universal history, founded, of course, on the idea
that God had taught the truths of religion, in a
great measure, by his moral and providential gov-
ernment over this present world." But

THE PRINCETON REVIEW

Regards it as a "monstrous doctrine that . . .
history is judicial"—and it so mixes up that doc-
trine with another that does not belong to it, but
is its opposite, namely, that "the strong are al-
ways right," as to be enabled to stigmatize it as
"simply diabolical."

So far from being true that the doctrine that
"history is judicial" implies that "the strong are
always right," that those who succeed ought to suc-
ceed, and that we must always take sides against
the afflicted and downtrodden—it implies the
very contrary. It teaches that the strong are not
always right, that when wrong they ought not to
succeed, that we must always take sides with the
afflicted and downtrodden, and relieve them, as
God also does, in his "judicial" punishment and
overthrow of their oppressors.

The passage to which we have alluded is the
following:

"The monstrous doctrine of Carlyle, and of the
modern philosophy, that the Weltgeschichte is the
Weltgericht, that history is judicial, that the strong
are always right, that those who succeed ought to suc-
ceed, and that we must always take sides against
the afflicted and downtrodden—it implies the
very contrary. It teaches that the strong are not
always right, that when wrong they ought not to
succeed, that we must always take sides with the
afflicted and downtrodden, and relieve them, as
God also does, in his 'judicial' punishment and
overthrow of their oppressors.

A more careful and disingenuous confusing and
transposing of things, we have never witnessed.
Carlyle, the modern philosopher, is the 'divine
right of kings' and conquerors, is also, like the
Princeton Review, a defender of the divine right
of re-enslaving the liberated blacks of the British
West Indies. Was it to reprove that, as 'diabolical',
a 'paraphrase of the Kingdom of Satan,' that the
Princeton Review alluded to Carlyle? Far from it.
The paragraph is leveled against those 'censorious
and pharisaical' persons who believe and teach that
God punishes nations for
such diabolical partnerships with Satan!"

In the same connection, for the same object,
"Edwards—'History of Redemption' The work,
though unfinished by the illustrious author, was pub-
lished after his decease.

possession by human slavery was more secure
of the Union than in it. The same Constitu-
tion which they have rejected, is being pleaded
for them, and an invitation is extended to come
back upon its protecting powers, that they may
find their slaveholding privileges laid up for them
according to their own slaveholding theology, an
inheritance divine, that nothing can alienate, un-
dermined and that fadeeth not away.

TIME TO PROVE OUR TITLE TO FREEDOM.

But you hear it said, Let these questions alone,
let the Constitution alone, till the war is over, and
then if any State dares to enslave the blacks, it
will be time to try conclusions, but not trouble
yourselves about these questions now. This is
somewhat as if when we are going to buy a piece
of land or an estate, the title to which is disputed,
we should be advised to let the question of the
title alone, till after we have advanced the pur-
chase money, and moved on to the estate, and
then see if anybody will dare to eject us. There
is not so great a fool in all Wall Street as to take
such advice. The time to prove the title is be-
fore you buy, or you may not only be ejected, but
lose all your money into the bargain. The time
to settle these Constitutional questions is now;
the time to determine the question whether we
have a Constitution for freedom or slavery or
both together is now; for we are laying our founda-
tions anew, and it is time we settled the ques-
tion whether we are building on the sand or on
the rock; whether we are on leased ground or on
fee simple, whether our ground rent and the re-
newal of our lease will not cut up all the prin-
ciple of our freedom. In fact we should be the
greatest fools that under the sun ever were en-
trusted with the work of reconstructing an en-
tire nation. If we should set one foot, one inch of
our building upon land not held in fee simple by
the people for the eternal freedom of themselves,
and their posterity.

"THE WAR."

The Princeton Review Reviewed.
—In the light of its own theology and ethics.

SUMMER SEVEN.

God in History. Is History Judicial?

USES OF HISTORY.

The grand, ultimate use of history; the end,
aim, and object of Scripture history, is the mani-
festation of God's glory, in his providential care,
morality, government, and sovereign control over
mankind—that some glory which he unveiled to
Moses, in declaring his own moral attributes,
(Exodus 24: 6, 7.) This manifestation necessarily
includes a correct delineation of man, his na-
ture, character, actions, and condition, the laws by
which he is governed, and the results of his con-
formity or non-conformity to those laws, which are
the laws of his Creator.

Man exists in society, in communities, in na-
tions, wherein human actions, human character,
and corresponding human conditions and desti-
nities, whether good or evil, whether happy or
wretched, whether elevated or degraded, are most
conspicuously witnessed, most readily distin-
guished, most conveniently recorded, most exten-
sively and most prominently known and remem-
bered.

History, accordingly, treats chiefly of man in
communities, in nations. Its province is to record
the founding and growth of nations, the influ-
ences that operate upon them, their diversities
and resemblances of character, their national as-
pirations, activities, and the results of them, under
divine Providence, and under the laws of social
humanity, which are the laws of their Creator,
the laws of their being.

This it is that makes history instructive; "phi-
losophy," or more properly, "theory," "teaching
by example." Aside from this, the study of his-
tory could lay no foundation for political science,
nor could any such science, on the principles of
inductive philosophy, ever be built; for the whole
purpose of national retribution underlies the di-
vine laws of moral and political cause and effect.
Aside from that purpose, therefore, the study of
history would be of no more value to the states-
man than the study of a kaleidoscope. For want
of a proper understanding of this, the reading of
history is dry, uninteresting, or of little use, to
most men. He only who sees the purpose, the
agency, the heart, and the hand of God, in his-
tory, has eyes wherewith to read history, for his
high and noble ends, the glory of God, and the
highest good of mankind. The College of New
Jersey once had a President who wrote an out-
line of a system of theology, in the form of an
universal history, founded, of course, on the idea
that God had taught the truths of religion, in a
great measure, by his moral and providential gov-
ernment over this present world." But

THE PRINCETON REVIEW

Regards it as a "monstrous doctrine that . . .
history is judicial"—and it so mixes up that doc-
trine with another that does not belong to it, but
is its opposite, namely, that "the strong are al-
ways right," as to be enabled to stigmatize it as
"simply diabolical."

So far from being true that the doctrine that
"history is judicial" implies that "the strong are
always right," that those who succeed ought to suc-
ceed, and that we must always take sides against
the afflicted and downtrodden—it implies the
very contrary. It teaches that the strong are not
always right, that when wrong they ought not to
succeed, that we must always take sides with the
afflicted and downtrodden, and relieve them, as
God also does, in his "judicial" punishment and
overthrow of their oppressors.

The passage to which we have alluded is the
following:

"The monstrous doctrine of Carlyle, and of the
modern philosophy, that the Weltgeschichte is the
Weltgericht, that history is judicial, that the strong
are always right, that those who succeed ought to suc-
ceed, and that we must always take sides against
the afflicted and downtrodden—it implies the
very contrary. It teaches that the strong are not
always right, that when wrong they ought not to
succeed, that we must always take sides with the
afflicted and downtrodden, and relieve them, as
God also does, in his 'judicial' punishment and
overthrow of their oppressors.

treasure and precious things, they have made her many widows in the midst thereof. Her priests have violated my law, and have profaned my holy things: they have no difference between the holy and profane, neither have they showed difference between the unclean and the clean, and have hid their eyes from my Sabbath, and I am profaned among them. Her princes, in the midst thereof, are like wolves, ravening the prey, to shed blood, and to destroy souls, to get dishonest gain. And her prophets have deceived them with untempered mortar, seeing vanity and divining lies unto them, saying, Thus saith the Lord God, when the Lord hath not spoken. The people of the land have used oppression, and exercised robbery, and have vexed the poor and needy: yea, they have oppressed the stranger wrongfully. And I sought for a man among them, that should make up the hedge, and stand in the gap before me for the land, that I should not destroy it: but I found none. Therefore have I poured out my indignation upon them; I have consumed them with the fire of my wrath: their own way have I recompensed upon their heads, saith the Lord God." (Verses 23 to 31, inclusive.)

What was this prophecy, is not history. Are not the heart and hand of God, the God of justice and mercy—the God of the oppressed, their refuge and deliverer, to be recognized as visible, in this history? Is not the "history judicial?" Shall not the judge of all the earth do right? Did he not "execute righteousness in Jacob?" Is not his righteousness from generation to generation? When his judgments are in the earth will not "the inhabitants of the world learn righteousness?"

(Consult the following Scriptures: Amos, chapters 4—Zephaniah, chapter 3—Zachariah, chapters 7, 8, and 11, for similar prophecies; in addition to those cited in former numbers. Nay, study the Psalms and the Prophecy, from beginning to end.)

OUR ENGLISH CORRESPONDENCE.

ELIOT VALE, BRACKNETH LONDON, S. E., April 7, 1863.

Dear Sir, Inclosed, in addition to the usual scraps from the Bradford Advertiser, are objects of various kinds, showing that things are going on favorably in Europe.

I enclose, among, at this present, by 789 French papers, has no need for comment.

The card of admission to the Public Meeting at Manchester, bears on its face the very valuable fact, that the Chairman is the old Chairman of the Free Trade League, whose very name carries with it the prestige of success. In the paper headed AMERICAN SLAVERY, I find also, in the first few lines, the name of the Rev. Dr. Massie, a Dissenting Minister of great note in Manchester and neighborhood, and who was one of the most active instruments of the League in the work of agitation and instruction. I had myself the honor of being his colleague, in a mission to rouse the ancient Britons of Wales, where we were obliged to have our addresses interpreted by Nonconformist ministers of the locality, it being understood that not one-fourth of the audience knew no English.

It is clear to me from all this, that the question is getting into good hands, and that the same men who so vigorously shook all kinds of administrations till they shook them into the right, are beginning to see that the welfare of the industrious classes of England, Kentucky had possessed the grace to see it, was in the speedy reduction of the South to free industry through the predominance of the North.

Yours very truly

T. PERCIVAL THOMPSON.

In a previous letter the same writer says:

The point our renegades and enthusiasts for slavery do their best to puzzle and conceal, is that to enforce on the South the substitution of wages for the procreator of cattle, instead of being a pecuniary loss to the Southern planters, would be a great gain, including the interest of what they would call the present value of their stock, as a way of making the security from servile insurrection.

If the American government was hearty in the national cause, it would soon find means to bring out the evidence of this.

The following are among the documents alluded to in the preceding:

AMERICAN SLAVERY.

The following address to the Ministers of the Gospel in this country, has been sent from Paris through the Rev. Dr. MASSIE. The distinguished Protestant pastors whose names are at the foot, attest that it has been signed by 688 Protestant ministers of France. Since the 15th of March, further signatures have been sent in, raising the total to the large number of 708.

To the ministers and pastors of all evangelical denominations in Great Britain.

PARIS, February 12, 1863.

Honored and beloved brethren in the Lord—

It is the glory of England, to have given to the world the example of abolishing first the slave trade, and then slavery. It is her glory to have continued for the last sixty years the work of suppressing universally the slave trade and slavery, at a cost, it is ascertained, of fifty millions of pounds sterling. And it is under God, chiefly by her religious men, to her Clarkson, her Wilberforce, her Buxton, to her missionary societies, that England owes this glory. Will not the sons and successors of these great Christians complete their work by arguing their country to declare itself openly for the holy cause of the liberation of the slaves in the terrible struggle which is at present convulsing the United States of America?

No more revealing spectacle has ever been seen before the civilized world than a Confederacy, consisting mainly of Protestants, forming itself, and demanding independence, the independent country of the Christian era, with a professed design of maintaining and propagating slavery; a Confederacy which lays down, as the cornerstone of its constitution, the system of slavery, as a way of making the security from servile insurrection.

If the American government was hearty in the national cause, it would soon find means to bring out the evidence of this.

The following are among the documents alluded to in the preceding:

AMERICAN SLAVERY.

The following address to the Ministers of the Gospel in this country, has been sent from Paris through the Rev. Dr. MASSIE. The distinguished Protestant pastors whose names are at the foot, attest that it has been signed by 688 Protestant ministers of France. Since the 15th of March, further signatures have been sent in, raising the total to the large number of 708.

To the ministers and pastors of all evangelical denominations in Great Britain.

PARIS, February 12, 1863.

Honored and beloved brethren in the Lord—

It is the glory of England, to have given to the world the example of abolishing first the slave trade, and then slavery. It is her glory to have continued for the last sixty years the work of suppressing universally the slave trade and slavery, at a cost, it is ascertained, of fifty millions of pounds sterling. And it is under God, chiefly by her religious men, to her Clarkson, her Wilberforce, her Buxton, to her missionary societies, that England owes this glory. Will not the sons and successors of these great Christians complete their work by arguing their country to declare itself openly for the holy cause of the liberation of the slaves in the terrible struggle which is at present convulsing the United States of America?

No more revealing spectacle has ever been seen before the civilized world than a Confederacy, consisting mainly of Protestants, forming itself, and demanding independence, the independent country of the Christian era, with a professed design of maintaining and propagating slavery; a Confederacy which lays down, as the cornerstone of its constitution, the system of slavery, as a way of making the security from servile insurrection.

If the American government was hearty in the national cause, it would soon find means to bring out the evidence of this.

The following are among the documents alluded to in the preceding:

AMERICAN SLAVERY.

The following address to the Ministers of the Gospel in this country, has been sent from Paris through the Rev. Dr. MASSIE. The distinguished Protestant pastors whose names are at the foot, attest that it has been signed by 688 Protestant ministers of France. Since the 15th of March, further signatures have been sent in, raising the total to the large number of 708.

To the ministers and pastors of all evangelical denominations in Great Britain.

PARIS, February 12, 1863.

Honored and beloved brethren in the Lord—

It is the glory of England, to have given to the world the example of abolishing first the slave trade, and then slavery. It is her glory to have continued for the last sixty years the work of suppressing universally the slave trade and slavery, at a cost, it is ascertained, of fifty millions of pounds sterling. And it is under God, chiefly by her religious men, to her Clarkson, her Wilberforce, her Buxton, to her missionary societies, that England owes this glory. Will not the sons and successors of these great Christians complete their work by arguing their country to declare itself openly for the holy cause of the liberation of the slaves in the terrible struggle which is at present convulsing the United States of America?

No more revealing spectacle has ever been seen before the civilized world than a Confederacy, consisting mainly of Protestants, forming itself, and demanding independence, the independent country of the Christian era, with a professed design of maintaining and propagating slavery; a Confederacy which lays down, as the cornerstone of its constitution, the system of slavery, as a way of making the security from servile insurrection.

If the American government was hearty in the national cause, it would soon find means to bring out the evidence of this.

The following are among the documents alluded to in the preceding:

AMERICAN SLAVERY.

The following address to the Ministers of the Gospel in this country, has been sent from Paris through the Rev. Dr. MASSIE. The distinguished Protestant pastors whose names are at the foot, attest that it has been signed by 688 Protestant ministers of France. Since the 15th of March, further signatures have been sent in, raising the total to the large number of 708.

To the ministers and pastors of all evangelical denominations in Great Britain.

PARIS, February 12, 1863.

Honored and beloved brethren in the Lord—

It is the glory of England, to have given to the world the example of abolishing first the slave trade, and then slavery. It is her glory to have continued for the last sixty years the work of suppressing universally the slave trade and slavery, at a cost, it is ascertained, of fifty millions of pounds sterling. And it is under God, chiefly by her religious men, to her Clarkson, her Wilberforce, her Buxton, to her missionary societies, that England owes this glory. Will not the sons and successors of these great Christians complete their work by arguing their country to declare itself openly for the holy cause of the liberation of the slaves in the terrible struggle which is at present convulsing the United States of America?

No more revealing spectacle has ever been seen before the civilized world than a Confederacy, consisting mainly of Protestants, forming itself, and demanding independence, the independent country of the Christian era, with a professed design of maintaining and propagating slavery; a Confederacy which lays down, as the cornerstone of its constitution, the system of slavery, as a way of making the security from servile insurrection.

If the American government was hearty in the national cause, it would soon find means to bring out the evidence of this.

The following are among the documents alluded to in the preceding:

AMERICAN SLAVERY.

The following address to the Ministers of the Gospel in this country, has been sent from Paris through the Rev. Dr. MASSIE. The distinguished Protestant pastors whose names are at the foot, attest that it has been signed by 688 Protestant ministers of France. Since the 15th of March, further signatures have been sent in, raising the total to the large number of 708.

To the ministers and pastors of all evangelical denominations in Great Britain.

PARIS, February 12, 1863.

Honored and beloved brethren in the Lord—

It is the glory of England, to have given to the world the example of abolishing first the slave trade, and then slavery. It is her glory to have continued for the last sixty years the work of suppressing universally the slave trade and slavery, at a cost, it is ascertained, of fifty millions of pounds sterling. And it is under God, chiefly by her religious men, to her Clarkson, her Wilberforce, her Buxton, to her missionary societies, that England owes this glory. Will not the sons and successors of these great Christians complete their work by arguing their country to declare itself openly for the holy cause of the liberation of the slaves in the terrible struggle which is at present convulsing the United States of America?

No more revealing spectacle has ever been seen before the civilized world than a Confederacy, consisting mainly of Protestants, forming itself, and demanding independence, the independent country of the Christian era, with a professed design of maintaining and propagating slavery; a Confederacy which lays down, as the cornerstone of its constitution, the system of slavery, as a way of making the security from servile insurrection.

If the American government was hearty in the national cause, it would soon find means to bring out the evidence of this.

The following are among the documents alluded to in the preceding:

AMERICAN SLAVERY.

The following address to the Ministers of the Gospel in this country, has been sent from Paris through the Rev. Dr. MASSIE. The distinguished Protestant pastors whose names are at the foot, attest that it has been signed by 688 Protestant ministers of France. Since the 15th of March, further signatures have been sent in, raising the total to the large number of 708.

To the ministers and pastors of all evangelical denominations in Great Britain.

PARIS, February 12, 1863.

Honored and beloved brethren in the Lord—

It is the glory of England, to have given to the world the example of abolishing first the slave trade, and then slavery. It is her glory to have continued for the last sixty years the work of suppressing universally the slave trade and slavery, at a cost, it is ascertained, of fifty millions of pounds sterling. And it is under God, chiefly by her religious men, to her Clarkson, her Wilberforce, her Buxton, to her missionary societies, that England owes this glory. Will not the sons and successors of these great Christians complete their work by arguing their country to declare itself openly for the holy cause of the liberation of the slaves in the terrible struggle which is at present convulsing the United States of America?

No more revealing spectacle has ever been seen before the civilized world than a Confederacy, consisting mainly of Protestants, forming itself, and demanding independence, the independent country of the Christian era, with a professed design of maintaining and propagating slavery; a Confederacy which lays down, as the cornerstone of its constitution, the system of slavery, as a way of making the security from servile insurrection.

If the American government was hearty in the national cause, it would soon find means to bring out the evidence of this.

The following are among the documents alluded to in the preceding:

AMERICAN SLAVERY.

The following address to the Ministers of the Gospel in this country, has been sent from Paris through the Rev. Dr. MASSIE. The distinguished Protestant pastors whose names are at the foot, attest that it has been signed by 688 Protestant ministers of France. Since the 15th of March, further signatures have been sent in, raising the total to the large number of 708.

To the ministers and pastors of all evangelical denominations in Great Britain.

SHIPS OF WAR FOR THE SLAVE-TRADE
CONFEDERACY.
A PUBLIC MEETING
FREE TRADE LANE, MANCHESTER.
ON WEDNESDAY, APRIL 23, 1863.
At 7 o'clock, P.M.
The object of the meeting is to discuss the practical steps to be taken in support of the Southern Slaveholders' Confederacy.
GEORGE WILSON, ESQ.
OF THE BAR,
PRESIDENT OF THE MEETING.
PLATFOON OF DISCUSSION: ONE SHILLING.
Ladies and Gentlemen: Admission Free.
Office of "Principia," Manchester.

The Principia.

NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, APRIL 30, 1863.

Our Continental Fund, for the gratuitous supply of the Principia, including a supply to Soldiers in the Army, is still overdrawn. New Subscribers are therefore needed. A gentle, man of Worcester County, Mass., has pledged one hundred dollars for fifty copies, for the army, which we have commenced sending. Who subscribes next?

Anniversary Meeting, in behalf of the Institution, 331 Sixth Avenue, for the Children of Deceased and Disabled Soldiers, on Wednesday evening, May 6, at the church, corner Second Avenue and Fourteenth St., (Rev. Dr. Asa D. Smith's). Addresses by Rev. J. T. Durvay, Theodore Tilton, and others. Music by the Hutchinson Family, and Recitations by Master Dudley Waller. "The Infant Orator."

The children of the Institution will be present. Exercises to commence at 7 1/2 o'clock. Single admission 25 cents.

Twenty-ninth Anniversary of the American Anti-Slavery Society.—The Twenty-ninth Anniversary of the American Anti-Slavery Society will be held in the Church of the Puritans, (Rev. Dr. Cheever's) in the city of New York, on Tuesday, May 12th, commencing at 10 o'clock, A.M.

The Society will hold another public meeting in the evening, in the Cooper Institute, commencing at half past 7 o'clock.

The business meetings of the Society will be held in the Lecture Room of the Church of the Puritans, on Tuesday, at 3 1/2 P.M., and on Wednesday, at 10 A.M.

The Anniversary Sermon before the Church Anti-Slavery Society, will be on Sabbath evening, May 10th, at the Church of the Puritans, by Rev. Dr. Cheever.

By order of the Sec. of the Church Anti-Slavery Society.

THE "STATE RIGHT" TO ENSLAVE ITS SUBJECTS.

THE RIGHT DEFINED AND ILLUSTRATED.

When it is said that a State has a right "to fix the legal status of its inhabitants," the first step toward a discussion of the proposition is to ascertain the full and correct meaning, intention, and character of it—the second thing is to inquire into the logical sequences and practical effects of it.

1. What is the meaning?

(1) What is a State? (2) What is it for a State to fix the legal status of its inhabitants?

1. In monarchial despotisms the absolute monarch claims to be the State. In aristocracies the nobles are accounted the State. In mixed monarchies, where the monarch and his nobles govern, the royal family and nobility exercise the functions of the State. But in a Democratic Republic, the people, the inhabitants are declared to constitute the State, and claim to be "sovereign."

2. To "fix the legal status of the inhabitants"—in the sense intended by those, in this country, who affirm that residing in a State, is to determine whether or not a part of the people shall be slaves, "chattel personal, in the hands of their owners and possessors, and their executors, administrators and assigns, to all intents, constructions and purposes whatsoever."—American Slave Code p. 23—24 Brevard's Digest 229—Prince's Digest, 446.

Our American States are required by the National Constitution, to be Republican States, and the National Government is required by its Constitution to "guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican form of government"—that is, a government wherein the people, the inhabitants, constitute the State. For, says Madison,

"It is essential to a Republican government that it be derived from the great body of Society, not from an inconsiderable or favored class of it."—Federalist No. 29.

And, says Jefferson,

"The true foundation of Republican Government is the equal rights of every citizen, in his person, in his property, and in his management."

And Mr. Jefferson calls the slaves "citizens."

For an American State to "fix the legal status of the inhabitants" so as to permit a portion of them to hold another portion of them as slaves, is for the State to permit one portion of the State to take away all the rights, and all the legal protection of another portion of the State. That part of the people of "the State" that is enslaved, cannot be supposed to consent to it. Even if they should, they would be then seceding from the State, which they could have no right to do, thus throwing off the responsibilities which the God of nature and of Society has committed to and imposed upon them.

If the State be something distinct from and above the people, what is it? Who composes it? By what authority do they become the State? Does it inhere in the slaveholders, in virtue of their slaveholding?

If the State be "the people," then the State right to enslave, is the right of the people to enslave one another, the strongest or most numerous to be the masters, the weakest or minority to be the slaves. Or, if the State be the creature, the servant of the people, then the "State right to enslave" is the right of the creature, the servant, to enslave those who created it to serve them.

What right, then, could "the State" or any portion of the State have, thus to "fix the legal status of the inhabitants" by whom was the right conferred? Not by the Creator—not by natural law, not by the law of nations, not by the English Common Law, not by the British Constitution, not by the Declaration of Independence, not by the Articles of Confederation, not by the Constitution of the United States. From whence is it then? The moral and political character of such a pretended right is most obvious.

II. But, supposing the right to exist? Or, at least to be consented to, and recognized as a right? What are the logical sequences of the admission? What would be natural effects and consequences of it?

1. The "State right to enslave a part or even one of the inhabitants, carries with it the State right to enslave any other or all of the inhabitants. Thus "the State" would soon come to signify the slaveholders, as an oligarchy—which, indeed, has long been the existing fact in the slave States.

The citizens of the States are citizens of the United States. The State right to enslave its own inhabitants, is the right to enslave the citizens of the United States, or (what comes to the same thing) to prevent those of the inhabitants of the United States from becoming its citizens, who would otherwise have become such!

2. It follows that "the State right" to enslave its citizens, is the State right to deprive the United States of its citizens, abjuring them thus from allegiance to the National Government, and withdrawing from them its protection. The right of

secession and rebellion is but an offshoot, an incident of this pretended "State right." It was simply by this very exercise of this impudently assumed and pusillanimously conceded "State right," that the present rebellion was gotten up, in the first place, and by the same process it is maintained to-day. Four millions of native born loyal citizens of the United States, are to-day, drawn from the support of our and their lawful Government by the Confederate denial of their citizenship, and by the acquiescence of our Government in the assumption. We do not call upon them as citizens to do the duty of citizens, because we concede the "State right" of enslaving them. Had the same "State right" enslaved as it has nearly done, with nearly the same effect) the remaining six millions, of paler hue, the result would have been the same. It is in vain for any man to concede the "State right" of enslaving "the people of the United States," or any portion of them, and yet attempt to keep up a show of resistance to the assumed right of secession, which logically, philosophically and necessarily springs from it. It is and forever will be in vain for the loyal states or the National Government to attempt it. To concede the "State right" to enslave any native born American, is to concede the State right of overturning the National Government, by enslaving its citizens.

3. The "State right" to enslave, is nothing more nor less than the right of the slaveholders to control the slave States, and through them to control the National Government, as has been done for forty years past, and is still doing. A smaller knot of slaveholders governing our National Government than ever before governed it. Before the rebellion broke out, it required upwards of three hundred thousand slaveholders to control our national policy. It is now controlled by not more than thirty thousand, in the border States, and in the exempted portions of Louisiana, Tennessee, Virginia, &c.

To the recognition of the "State right" to enslave, the country owes all its disgrace, humiliation and entanglement. It is this, and nothing else, that prevents our crushing the Rebellion.

The "State right" to enslave the inhabitants of a State, carries with it, of necessity, the "State right" of inflicting any other injuries upon them—especially any minor ones—indeed, "prayer tell us, what others are not minor?" If the "State right" may rob a man of himself, may it not, mercifully do him the favor to commute the terrible sentence, by seizing all his property and letting him go free, to earn more? If it may take from him his wife and child, may it not, instead, give only their services, their wardrobe, their kitchen and parlor furniture, and leave the man his loved ones, to provide for, in the best way he can? If it may deny to him the right to make any contract, even the contract of marriage, may it not, instead, restrict him, in the choice of a wife, to such classes and descriptions of women as it may desire to designate and specify? If it may deny to him the benefits of education, or permit his master to do so, may it not, instead of this, restrict his reading to the literature that may be selected for him as best adapted to give him "sound political information?" If it may take away, or authorize the taking away of all his religious rights and privileges, may it not provide for him an established religion?

What vestige of civil or religious liberty, what right to personal protection and security could remain to a people who could be insane enough to endorse the principle that a State has a right to authorize or to permit the enslavement of its inhabitants?

If a State may allow one man to rob another of himself and earnings, on what principle, or to what good purpose, can it forbid one man to commit burglary, theft, or robbery on another man? If it may sanction the annihilation of all rights, how can it be authorized to afford protection for any rights? If it may withdraw from a portion of the people the protection of law, how can it provide and enforce legal protection for another portion of them? If it releases one portion of the community from all legal restraints in their treatment of another portion of the community, how shall it maintain any legal restraint on any portion of the community for the protection of anybody? How much of legal restraint is there now, in our American slave States?

6. The "State right to fix the legal status of the inhabitants" so as to permit slavery, is therefore "the State right" to disorganize the State, to abdicate Civil Government, to disband society, to introduce either anarchy or despotism, or both combined, to annul all law but the law of the strongest, for the time being, whether of the few or of the many.

Such is the condition, to day of the State wherein the "State right" to tolerate slavery has been allowed to have full sway, and work out its horrible experiment, as a warning to mankind.

7. To concede the "State right" to establish and maintain slavery, is to concede the right of whoever may seize upon the power of the State, to make slaves of ourselves and our posterity. For illustration:

Suppose Horatio Seymour, the millionaire of Fifth Avenue, the bankers of Wall Street, the Delmonico Copperheads, the conservative confederates of Lord Lyons, with the aid of Fernando and Ben. Wood, Isaiah Rynders, Tammany, Mozart, the rowdy longshoremen, the liquor dealers' as, association, Five Points, the World, the Herald, the Express, the Journal of Commerce, the New York Observer, and the Knights of the Golden Circle should combine together and succeed in becoming "the State," they would be then principles accepted to and defended by the N. Y. Tribune, because they would be the "State right" of enslaving whomsoever they pleased. By the exercise of that "right" they would be guilty of no usurpation, would contravene no law. The Constitution would shield them. We could obtain no legal redress. The National Government, according to the Tribune, could not interfere in our behalf. We should have no remedy but rebellion and revolution. We protest against the doctrine.

Is this putting an extreme case? Is it supposing an impossible or improbable contingency? By no means. The violent mobs and attempted legislation, even at the North, to suppress anti-slavery discussion, the sympathy with pro-slavery treason, reveals the disposition and the tendency. The unresisted exercise of the right conceded by the Tribune in sixteen of the States reveals to us the inevitable fate of the remaining States, unless the pretended "right" be indignantly repudiated. To concede it is to invite it, and to promise abject submission, beforehand. The Tribune's concession of the right, by its own explanation of it, was a concession to the "Copperheads" arising from a fear of their power, and a sense of the necessity of conciliating them. It is too late then, to say that the supposition we have made is too impossible or improbable to deserve consideration. The contingency, it seems, has already been contemplated. The Tribune goes for concession and submission. The Principia is for protest and defiant opposition.

8. The question of tolerating any further experiments of such "State rights" in this country is the question of permitting the total and final subversion of our free institutions. It is the question of government or no government, of law or no law; the question whether Government shall retain any hold on the affections, the confidence, the consciences, or the moral and religious convictions of the people.

The grand object, end, aim, and benefit of Civil Government is the protection of human rights, the security of the subject, the citizen, who, "for this cause, pays tribute"—and acknowledges allegiance. The right of a State or of a Government to enslave, or to permit enslavement, would be the right to reverse this end, to abjure this aim, to inflict deadly injuries in return for support and allegiance.

The recognition of such a "State right" would forebode and justify a recognition of the Rebel Confederacy organized for the security of that pretended right. The only "right" of such a State is a right to judicial overthrow by Divine Providence, the reprobation of history, and the execution of mankind.

BORDER STATE LOYALTY.

KENTUCKY NULLIFICATION.

The President's policy of proclaiming emancipation only in rebel states and enforcing it only in localities and at times when it judges it will promote the Union cause, is producing its natural results. Kentucky, by force of national arms, and with difficulty, is kept nominally loyal, and is, of course, one of the so-called loyal border States, and, as such, is exempted from the President's proclamation. Nevertheless the Kentucky Legislature has recently passed an act nullifying the Proclamation.

The following is from the Frankfort (Ky.) Commonwealth of 11th inst.

"An act of the Kentucky Legislature, approved March 2, 1863, declared null and void, and unenforced, freedom under the President's Proclamation shall be treated as runaway slaves, and shall accordingly under the laws now in force on that subject. It is made the duty of all peace officers to see this law carried out. Under the provisions of the laws of Kentucky, many fugitive runaway slaves have been committed to jail."

"The Cincinnati Gazette and one John H. Aughey, who 'escaped from Dixie via the underground railroad,' hope that the United States authorities in Kentucky will not permit such an outrage in the face of the Emancipation Proclamation. We are not informed whether Mr. Aughey is a runaway slave. One would suppose from his allusion to the underground railroad, a long-established Abolitionist, and one who, therefore, is not a runaway slave. But whether he is or not, the advice which he and The Gazette give should be heeded by all military authorities. They have as much to say to the military as we have, and are becoming the champion of the negro. There is no cause for their insulting Kentucky and out-raging her laws, by trampling them under foot. Kentucky is a loyal State, and should be treated as such. She has said, through her Legislature and by the almost unanimous voice of her people, that her laws shall be maintained; and we are inclined to think that she will carry out her determination."

As the President's Proclamation of January 1st did not include Kentucky, the question naturally arises: What does this new enactment of the Kentucky Legislature mean? What complaint could Kentucky have against the Proclamation? It was intended, by this act, to kidnap and re-enslave the freedmen from rebel states who should be caught on her territory?

By turning back to the President's Proclamation of September 22d, it will be seen that, in that document, the President said "Attention is called to an act of Congress, approved July 17, 1862" wherein it is provided that "all slaves of persons hereafter engaged in rebellion against the Government of the United States &c., &c., 'all slaves captured from such persons or deserted by them, &c., &c., shall be deemed captives of war, and shall be forever free from their servitude, and not again held as slaves.'"

We infer then, as the Tribune seems to do, that the Kentucky act was designed as a direct nullification of that act of Congress, proclaimed by the President to be in force, Sept. 22, 1862. Probably however, it is likewise designed to apply to slaves from the rebel States, liberated by the Proclamation of Jan. 1, 1863.

Whether it applies to one or both the Proclamations, the issue is now fairly made. The State of Kentucky, of whose "loyalty" we have heard so many laudations, in and out of Congress, from Republicans as well as Democrats, has openly and defiantly planned herself in direct hostility to the authority of the United States. And this the "Union" State of Kentucky does, in defiance of the right of rebel to hold slaves declared free by the Federal Government!

This, it seems, is the reward the Administration gets, in return for its subservience to "Border State policy."

Will it submit, once more, to the oligarchy? We shall see.

POSITION OF GERRIT SMITH.

The following, from a near neighbor and intimate friend of Gerrit Smith, contains, we cannot doubt, a correct statement of his views.

